

Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission

1736 WYNKOOP SUITE 302
DENVER, COLORADO 80202
(303) 298-8001

Board of Directors:

President

Joe Tempel
Denver 757-9931

Vice-President

Joe Goldfield, P.E.
Denver 321-7276

Secretary

Paula Eloffson-Gardine
Arvada 420-2967

Treasurer

Greg Marsh
Arvada 421-3383

Adrienne Anderson

Denver 333-9714

Cele Biggs, Ph.D.

Boulder 494-4288

Meir Carasso, Ph.D.

Lakewood 986-2371

Eugene Demayo, O.D.

Golden 642-3117

Evan Freinich J.D.

Boulder 444-8173

Kim R. Grace

Westminster 466-1212

Sue Hurst

Denver 830-7295

William Kemper, Ph.D.

Denver 236-2148

Ken Lichtenstein, MD

Denver 333-3077

Tom Rauch

Denver 832-4508

COMMENTS on the 881 HILLSIDE VOL. 1 DRAFT

GREGORY K. MARSH, Treasurer, Rocky Flats Cleanup Commission

Although plutonium deposition on the area surrounding the RFP as a result of the 1957 and 1969 fires and other events is not well understood, the fact remains the National Institute of Standards and Technology (formerly the National Bureau of Standards) chose the soil from the RFP, in July, 1978, to make a plutonium in soil standard. Specifically, the standard, SRM 4353, was made from a 13 cm deep sample taken along the east perimeter fence just north of the southeast corner of the RFP. To make this standard, 600 kg of this soil was 'diluted' with 300 kg of soil taken from near the western fence to get the plutonium concentration down to a level of about ten (10) times average, world-wide 'background' levels.* This standard reference material is now being used by the scientific community around the world to calibrate their instruments.

Given this fact, how can the surface of 881 hillside where the french drain is proposed, which is 2.9 kms west of the place from where the soil standard was taken, be free of surface plutonium contamination?

* From a conversation with Robin Hutchinson, NIST, Gaithersburg, MD. on 12 July, 1989.

After an in-depth discussion with Mr. Tom Greengard of the methods used to determine what, where, and why to drill the monitoring wells that are used to assess the the 881 hillside it seems that no industry accepted protocol was followed. What is the statistical validity of the methods used? If the methods used are invalid and hence a wrong assessment made, was this a cover-up to conceal more important and dangerous conditions elsewhere?



Development of some natural matrix standards-progress report,
Environment International, Vol. 3, pp 395-398, Pergamon Press
1980. Published in Great Britain.